

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed May 26, 2006, Applicants sincerely request reconsideration in view of the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-19, 21, and 24-28 are currently pending in the application. Claims 1-3, 5-19, 21, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Beauregard et al. (U.S. Patent 5,974,413, hereinafter "Beauregard") in view of Church et al. (U.S. Patent 5,541,836, hereinafter "Church"). Claims 1, 10, 19, 25, 26, and 27 have been amended to clarify the subject matter and correct minor informalities. Claims 5, 15, and 28 have been cancelled without disclaimer or prejudice.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-19, 21, and 24-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Beauregard, et al (hereinafter "Beauregard"), U.S. patent No. 5,974,413, filed 07/03/1997. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments overcome this rejection and add no new matter.

Applicants' amended claim 1 recites a method for semantically labeling a string of text in the electronic document created in an application program module that includes, *inter alia*, "transmitting the string of text to a plurality of recognizer plug-ins during an idle time", "compiling the labels into a plurality of semantic categories at the recognizer dynamic-link library", and "transmitting the semantic categories to the application program module such that each label is associated with the string of text." The amendments are supported by the Specification (Specification, page 3, lines 25 - 34). Among other differences, *Beauregard* does not teach the features of amended claim 1.

Contrary to claim 1, *Beauregard* teaches system and method that allows a user to use their everyday language or user defined words to operate a computer in a highly efficient way. (*Beauregard*: Abstract, col. 4, lines 34-36). According to *Beauregard*, a semantic user interface (SUI) is provided that enhances the operation of the current standard window-based interface by allowing a user to enter "commands" in his everyday natural language in order to control the operations of the computer (*Beauregard*: Abstract, col. 1, lines 5-10). Specifically, *Beauregard* does not teach or suggest transmitting the string of text to a plurality of recognizer plug-ins during an idle time or compiling labels, which are determined by annotating the string of text, into a plurality of semantic categories at the recognizer dynamic-link library.

Furthermore, *Beauregard*, as alleged by the Office Action, does not teach automatically receiving the string of text in a recognizer dynamic-link library. In the paragraphs including lines 28-55 in column 32, *Beauregard* describes archiving user text where a basic block of archived text is captured during a session with switching from one application to another starting another session. This is not even close to the claimed subject matter as recited in amended claim 1. Moreover, *Beauregard* teaches each record containing the actual text stream and a tag identifying the application and the file that were foremost when the text block was archived (*Beauregard*: col. 32, lines 48-50). Again, the tag described by *Beauregard* is completely different from the labels that are used for semantically labeling the string of text and are compiled into the plurality of semantic categories.

Therefore, amended claim 1 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 24 depend from amended independent claim 1 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 24 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 1.

Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 2, 3, 6-8, and 24 should also be withdrawn. Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants' amended claim 10 recites a method for labeling a string of text in an electronic document as the electronic document is created in an application program module that includes, *inter alia*, "as the string of text is entered into the electronic document, automatically receiving the string of text in a recognizer dynamic link library during an idle time after the string of text has been entered in the electronic document and determining whether the string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings according to semantic categories" and "transmitting the semantic categories to the application program module."

Beauregard fails to teach or suggest automatically receiving the string of text in a recognizer dynamic link library during an idle time after the string of text has been entered and determining whether the string of text matches one of a plurality of stored strings according to semantic categories. In addition, the label as recited in claim 10 is different from the tag described by *Beauregard*, as discussed above. *Beauregard* also fails to anticipate transmitting the semantic categories to the application program module. Therefore, amended claim 10 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 11-14 and 16-18 depend from amended independent claim 10 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 11-14 and 16-18 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 10. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 11-14 and 16-18 should also be withdrawn. Claim 15 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants' amended claim 19 recites a system for labeling a string in an electronic document as the string is entered into the electronic document that includes, *inter alia*, "a recognizer dynamic link library connected to the application program module, wherein the

recognizer dynamic link library automatically receives the string during an idle time after the string has been entered in the electronic document" and "at least one recognizer plug-in connected to the recognizer dynamic link library, wherein the at least one recognizer plug-in receives the string, annotates the string to determine a label according to semantic categories."

As discussed above, *Beauregard* fails to teach or suggest a recognizer dynamic link library that automatically receives the string during an idle time after the string has been entered in the electronic document and a recognizer plug-in that receives the string, annotates the string to determine a label according to semantic categories. The label as recited in claim 19 is, again, different from the tag described by *Beauregard*, as mentioned previously. Therefore, amended claim 19 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 25, and 26 depend from amended independent claim 19 with additional features. Thus, dependent claims 21, 25, and 26 are allowable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claim 19. Therefore, based on the foregoing, the rejection of claims 21, 25, and 26 should also be withdrawn.

Applicants' amended claim 27 recites a computer-readable medium with instructions stored thereon for semantically labeling a string of text in the electronic document created in an application program module where the instructions include, *inter alia*, "transmitting the string of text to a plurality of recognizer plug-ins during an idle time", "in each of the plurality of recognizer plug-ins, annotating the string of text to determine a label according to semantic categories" and "associating each label with the string of text."

Beauregard fails to teach or suggest transmitting the string of text to a plurality of recognizer plug-ins during an idle time and annotating the string of text to determine a label according to semantic categories. The label associated with the string of text as recited in claim

27 is different from the tag described by *Beauregard*, as mentioned previously. Therefore, amended claim 27 is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully request that this Amendment After Final be entered, placing the claims in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully submit that the proposed amendments of the claims do not raise new issues or necessitate the undertaking of any additional search of the art, since all of the elements and their relationships claimed were either earlier claimed or inherent in the claims as examined. Therefore, this Amendment should allow for immediate action.

Finally, Applicants respectfully submit that the entry of the Amendment would place the application in better form for appeal, should the patentability of the pending claims be disputed.

Conclusion

A request for a three-month extension of time is requested for the period of August 26, 2006 through November 26, 2006, and is submitted with this amendment.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD



D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

Date: November 21, 2006

Merchant & Gould, LLC
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
Telephone: 404.954.5100

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE